



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

in Egypt, which is followed by their capture by the pirates; Act II, the exit from the cave, the escape of Clitophon to the Egyptian soldiers, the supposed sacrifice of Leucosie; Act III, the rescue of Leucosie and the meeting with Chae-reas; Act IV, the abduction of Leucosie, the pursuit, her death; Act V, Clitophon's lamentation over the heroine's headless body, brought before the audience on a *brancart de deuil*.

To confirm the evidence given as to the source of *Leucosie*, it may be added that not only the original Greek of Tatius, but also Latin and French translations had been published before *Leucosie* appeared; that Hardy had shown in his other plays a preference for Greek subjects and had dramatized another late Greek romance, the *Ethiopics* of Heliodorus; that it would seem strange if the author of some seven hundred plays overlooked a work so well adapted to his needs as was *Clitophon and Leucippe*; that the similarity of the names, Leucosie and Leucippe, suggests that this story is his source, as he frequently called his plays after their heroines. It is quite possible that Hardy changed his heroine's name as well as her fate in order to distinguish this play from Du Ryer's, which follows the original Greek closely and was played in the same years and at the same theater as *Leucosie*. According to this theory, the play would be among Hardy's last productions, written in the years 1629-1631, a dating which its appearance in the first part of Mahelot's *Mémoire* would tend to confirm.

For the second play, *Parténie*, I have only a suggestion, which Mahelot's requirements cannot be said to prove. The scribe writes:

Première journée de Parténie de M. Hardy.

Il faut deux palais, une prison, deux flambeaux, deux lances, des trompettes, du papier, des masques pour se déguiser, des rondaches et des fleurets, un rondache où il y ayt un portraict.

Parténie, seconde journée, de M. Hardy.

Il faut deux palais, une chambre fermée et un lit, un brancart, une teste feinte, un bassin, un licol, un poignard, une fiole pleine de vin ou d'eau, des trompettes, un drap pour un ombre, des flames et des socisions.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, folios 31 verso, 32, and 33 recto.

Now the title represents the French form of Parthenius, the name of the chamberlain who assassinated Domitian. The accounts of the emperor's murder given by Suetonius<sup>8</sup> and Dion Cassius<sup>9</sup> were accessible to Hardy and explain one palace, the room, bed, dagger, and the litter on which the dead emperor was hurried off to his grave. Domitian's vision of Rusticus accounts for the sheet, the ghost, and the fire-works. The tragic love-affair of his empress and the actor, Paris, might well require the masks, the paper, the prison, and the flask. The second palace, the torches, lances, trumpets, and weapons are unimportant additions, easily understood. But the *rondache où il y ayt un portraict*, the *bassin*, the *licol*, and the *teste feinte* are too definite to be neglected. Not one of them, it is true, is incompatible with a tragedy treating of Domitian's murder by Parthenius, yet, until their presence is thoroughly explained, the play cannot be identified with certainty.<sup>10</sup>

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Amherst College.

## THE CYNEWULFIAN RUNES OF THE RELIGIOUS POEMS

When the Old English poet, Cynewulf, inserted his name in runic letters into four important poems, *Christ*, *Juliana*, *Elene* and *Fates of the Apostles*, he had even less intent of puzzling his readers than had his famous predecessor, Aldhelm, when he wrote large in an acrostic at the beginning of his Latin Enigmas, "Aldhelmus cecinit mille-

<sup>8</sup> *Domitian*, 16, 17.

<sup>9</sup> *Roman History*, LXVII, 3, 13, 15, 16, 17.

<sup>10</sup> Mr. C. E. Andrews of Amherst has called my attention to Massinger's introduction of Parthenius into his *Roman Actor* (licensed, 1626). There is, of course, no question of influence, but it is interesting to note that Domitian's jealousy of Paris, his vision of Rusticus's ghost, and his murder by Parthenius and his associates furnished dramatic material to one of Hardy's contemporaries.

nis versibus odas." <sup>1</sup> The difficulties that have assailed so many modern interpreters of these runes not only could never have been anticipated by the writer, but could never have been appreciated, indeed even imagined, by his contemporary audience. The man of the eighth and ninth centuries found sun-clear the symbols that have often beriddled the man of the nineteenth and twentieth. My aim, therefore, is not to offer opinion—of this there has already been far too much—but to present definite evidence bearing on the attitude of early Englishmen to runic letters, which has been but imperfectly understood.

Let us turn immediately to that misconception of runic use which has done more than all other causes combined to obscure the four Cynewulfian passages. It is asserted by Trautmann <sup>2</sup> that the poetic employment of runes is not limited to the substitution of these symbols for their accepted names and to the employment of groups of these in the rôle of ordinary letters, but that a rune may often be regarded as the initial letter of a missing word. For the support of this sweeping assertion which he and others (such excellent scholars as Strunk <sup>3</sup> and C. F. Brown <sup>4</sup> among the number) soon exalt to the rank of established fact, Trautmann brings not a jot of real evidence. He points, it is true, to the use of the rune *W* for *weard* in *Elene*, 1090, on *wuldres W*; but, unfortunately for his argument, Sievers' reading *wynn* <sup>5</sup> (the letter's word-name) is established beyond the shadow of a doubt not only by the appearance of *wuldres wynn* fifty lines before (*El.* 1040), but by the close likeness of our riming line, on *wuldres wynn bide wigena þrym* to *Andreas* 887, *þær was wuldres wynn, wīgendra þrym*, <sup>6</sup> and to *Juliana*, 641, *Gemunað wigena wyn ond wuldres þrym*. His only other example of the substitution in question is equally unhappy. According to Trautmann, <sup>7</sup> the runes at the close of *The Husband's Message*, *S*, *R* and *EA*, *W*, and *M* stand for *Sige-Rēd*, *Ēad-Wīne* and *Monn* respectively.

<sup>1</sup> In a previous article (*M. L. N.*, December, 1910) I have interpreted the charade-acrostic, with which Cynewulf, following old custom, prefaces the *Riddles*.

<sup>2</sup> *Bonner Beiträge (BB)*, I, 45.

<sup>3</sup> *Juliana*, Boston, 1904.

<sup>4</sup> *Englische Studien*, 38 (1907), 196-233.

<sup>5</sup> *Anglia*, XIII, 5-6.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Bosworth-Toller, p. 1289.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Anglia*, XVI, 219.

This is manufactured evidence, inasmuch as there is not the least reason to regard these five runes as anything else than a letter-group forming a single word <sup>8</sup>—such a runic letter-group, indeed, as we meet in the *Riddles*, 20, 25, 43, 65, 75, in the *Salomon and Saturn* and in the *Juliana* charade. Trautmann is certainly debarred from calling into court *The Husband's Message* letters to sustain his assertion that a rune may suggest any word of which it is the initial. His whole theory collapses for want of support. <sup>9</sup>

The upshot of the preceding discussion is that no tangible evidence of the literary use of initial runes has as yet been offered; nor indeed could any be found, searched one ever so widely, since no Old English poet would ever have dreamed of putting even in a riddle such a strain upon the powers of his readers. The most provoking of enigmatographs does not ask his victim to furnish an entire word from the slight clew of a single letter, <sup>10</sup> far less does a poet whose purpose is not to confound but to enlighten. Had Cynewulf made the mistake of so doing, the result would have been just such confusion as that wrought among modern scholars, who have started from this utterly false assumption. For the rune *Y* one reader would have suggested *yrmdū*, another *ȳst*, a third *ȳfel*; for the rune *U*, *ufan*, *uppe*, *unne* would have been offered in turn; for *C*, *cearu*, *ceorl*, *cyn* and *cempa*. *Æle him hafað sun-dorsefan*. But it is suggested that Cynewulf went to greater extremes of unreason and implied that in some cases the runes were to be viewed as symbols for their naming words, in others merely as initial letters. It seems almost incredible that no voice has been raised in protest against this unwarranted assumption, but that, on the contrary, the purely imaginary process has been tacitly accepted by many as a rule of the game. It is not a rule of the game. In no passage of Old English poetry

<sup>8</sup> Other scholars agree that a single name is designed, but they differ widely in their interpretation of this. My own view of the *H. M.* passage will be presented at length, elsewhere.

<sup>9</sup> It must be noted that the runic letters above *Riddles* 9 and 18 are no part of the riddler's design, but merely the memoranda of a late scribe.

<sup>10</sup> In *Rid.* 65 the poet provides so large a part of each missing word, that the solver looking at the context is troubled but little.

is a rune used merely as an initial letter ; but in each case, save in the letter groups of which I have already spoken, is a substitute for one definite word. That word is always the name assigned to the rune by long tradition and associated with it in runic alphabets and hence immediately suggested to the thought of every early reader. In *Elene* 789<sup>11</sup> and 1090, and in *Rid.* 91<sup>1</sup>, *W* represents *wynn* ; in the *Ruin*, 24, as in the *Durham Ritual* (*Surtees Society*, 10, pp. 13, 21, 26, 60, 81), the *M*-rune stands for *man* ; in the *Durham Ritual*, pp. 25, 26, 60, 66, the *D*-rune equals *dæg* ; in *Waldere* A. 31 and in *Beowulf* 931, the rune *Æ* is equivalent to *æðel* or *ēðel*. Such was the invariable method of other Old English poets and of Cynewulf himself in other passages. We shall see that such was his method in the runic acrostics.

We have yet other evidence bearing on the use of runes for acrostic purposes. The many Scandinavian illustrations of runic method that I have adduced in my previous article<sup>12</sup> amply sustain the contention that, "in typical runic acrostics, the rune was so obviously associated with a definite naming word that, at the sight of its name or the synonym of this, the reader immediately supplied the symbol." Cynewulf's *First Riddle* certainly seems to be thoroughly in accord with this runic tradition. In *Riddle* 43, the set names of the symbols, *Nȳd*, *Æsc*, *Æc* and *Hægel* suggest at once the letters *N*, *Æ*, *A* and *H*. Conversely at the sight of the symbol, every Old English reader substituted the set name.

Having marked that the name of each runic letter is definitely fixed, let us note that the meaning of this name frequently varies. This variation is due to two causes. The first of these is the love of word-play illustrated by so many passages in Old English and Old Norse poetry.<sup>13</sup> *Rād* (the name of the *R*-rune) appears in the Old English *Runic Poem*, 13-15, with the two meanings of "modulation" and "riding"; in the alphabet in Cott. ms. Domitian A 9, fol. 10<sup>14</sup> it is defined

as "consilium." *Sigel* (the *S*-rune) may be interpreted either as "sail" or "sun" in the *Runic Poem*, 45-48 ; it is explained as the one ("velum") in the Domitian alphabet ; it is a synonym of the other, as used above and below *Rid.* 7, and such is its meaning in its later history. A far more potent reason for change of meaning lies in the circumstance that old names handed down by tradition become unintelligible in other times and among other peoples. The *C*- or *K*-rune, *Cēn*, which is described as "torch" in the Old English *Runic Poem*, 16-18, appears in the Old Norse *Runic Poems*<sup>15</sup> as *Kaun*, "boil." *Ūr* (the *U*-rune), the "bison" of English runic verse, 3-6, is glossed "noster" in the Domitian alphabet,<sup>16</sup> and becomes "dross" in one Old Norse poem, and "rain" in the other, keeping this last meaning until the days of Ole Worm and the Icelandic logographs (see my first article). The difficult *Y*-rune, *ȳr*, has in one Norse poem its old meaning, "bow" side by side with the new connotation, "brittle iron," while in the other verses it is interpreted as "yew-tree." It is exceedingly significant that these three runes, *C*, *U* and *Y* are the ones in which Cynewulf's meanings differ from those assigned to the symbols in the English *Runic Poem*.

Either because the *C*-rune or *Cēn*, as it is called in every alphabet, was not associated with the idea of "torch" in the minds of Cynewulf and his public (such a connotation is confined to the *Runic Poem*), or because such a meaning, even though known to him, was quite unsuited to his purpose, Cynewulf used the symbol to represent that form and signification of its word-name which would occur to every reader, *Cēne*, "bold." This sense of the word is so thoroughly in accord with the context in the *Christ*, *Elene* and *Fates* passages,<sup>17</sup> that it has found wide acceptance. Trautmann's chief criticisms of this reading may

ments, II, 830. Hempl, *Modern Philology*, I, 135, presents a half-tone reproduction of the Domitian leaf, and discusses the relation of its alphabet to Hickes' printed copy of the *Runic Poem* (in the burned Cott. Otho B. 10).

<sup>11</sup> See Sievers, *Anglia*, XIII, 6-7.

<sup>12</sup> *M. L. N.*, December, 1910.

<sup>13</sup> See *Rid.* 18<sup>2</sup>, 32<sup>14</sup>, 38<sup>7</sup>, 73<sup>22</sup>, 93<sup>22</sup> ; *Heiðreks Gátur*, No. 34 ; *Skáldskaparmál*, § 74 (*Snorra Edda*, I, 544) ; *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, II, 172, 272, 300, 327, 329.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Hickes, *Thesaurus*, I, 136 ; Stephens, *Runic Monu-*

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Wimmer, *Runenschrift*, pp. 275 f.

<sup>16</sup> That the *B*-rune, *Beorc* ("birch") is explained by the Domitian scribe as *Berc*, "cortex," is due to his lapse in second-hand knowledge.

<sup>17</sup> Moreover, *beaducāfa* is an exact synonym of *cēne* (*O*) in *Rid.* 1<sup>10</sup>.

be easily dismissed. His first objection that runes may stand only for substantives vanishes with his acceptance<sup>18</sup> of Gollancz's *yfel* as the equivalent of the *y*-rune. His second objection that *cēne* does not conform with the metre<sup>19</sup> topples over at a touch, as it has not the least foundation in fact. *Elene* 1258<sup>b</sup>, *cēne drūsende* (∠x / ∠xx) and *Christ* 796<sup>a</sup>, *bonne cēne cwacað* (xx∠ / xǫx) are usual forms of Sievers' D and B types. The *Fates* line (103<sup>a</sup>), as we shall see in considering the *Y*-rune, is also metrically impeccable. It is impossible to cavil further at this interpretation of the *C*-rune.

It would only confuse our treatment of Cynewulf's name of the Old English *Y*-rune, to enter now into a long review of the early history of the quite different symbol which represents the *y*-sound in Old Norse.<sup>20</sup> We may also avert needless discussion by recognizing that everywhere in Old English—in the Inscriptions and in the runic *Riddles* (20, 25, 43, 65, 75)—the same runes designate short and long vowels. So here in Cynewulf's religious poems, the *Y*-rune obviously represents a short *y*, just as the *U*-rune here indicates a short *u*. Now every shred of evidence points to *Țr* as the name of the O. E. runic symbol for *Ț*. Such is the testimony not only of the O. E. *Runic Poem* but of many early alphabets, either English or of English origin—the St. Gall ms. No. 878 of the ninth century (*yr, al bihabendi*),<sup>21</sup> the Vienna ms. Salzburg 71 (now 140) of about 900, and the Cott. mss. Domitian A 9 and Galba A 2.<sup>22</sup> The name, *Țr*, appears also in the O. N. *Runic Poems*<sup>23</sup> and in corrupted forms in later continental mss. (*ir, uyr, yur*, etc.). This evidence harmonizes with the supposed derivation of *Țr* from *Țr*, the name of the runic letter

*U*, from which the *Y*-symbol (which we meet on the very early Thames Knife) is formed. So we may with safety regard *Țr* as the name of the *Y*-rune at every period of its history.<sup>24</sup> To no Anglo-Saxon could the symbol have possibly suggested *Țst*, or *Țrmðu*, or *yfel* which has been generally accepted.

If we have little reason to hesitate over the name of the symbol *Țr*, we may well pause upon the interpretation of the name. What does *Țr* mean in our acrostics? Certainly this name-word has not here the meaning "bow," that it bears in the Old English and Icelandic runic poems or in the significations of the rune-names in *Arna-Magn.* 687, p. 3,<sup>25</sup> *Arcus er bogi, bogi er Țr, Țr er rīnastafr*.<sup>26</sup> The required form of *Țr* must discharge the twofold function of an abstract noun and of a masculine adjective used substantively. No contemporary reader of our LWS. versions of the Cynewulfian poems would have had far to search; for the only word that satisfies the conditions of both form and meaning is *Țr(re)*, "anger," "wrathful," "confused." The shorter form of the word is found in a masculine adjective, *Gen.* 63, *Țr on mōðe*.

Here a large dialectal difficulty confronts us. We cannot, it is true, determine definitely the original dialect of Cynewulf,<sup>27</sup> but we can feel sure that it was not LWS. And only in LWS. do *Țr*, "bow" and *Țr(re)*, "anger," "wrathful" bear a very close resemblance. In the EWS. of Alfred the adjective is *irre* or *ierre*;<sup>28</sup> in Anglian, in which Cynewulf probably wrote, the form seems to have been *iorre* (*Durham Ritual*) or *eorre* (*Vespasian Psalter*).<sup>29</sup> But we must not therefore allow ourselves to be forced to the con-

<sup>18</sup>BB, xxiii, 138.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 145.

<sup>20</sup>Wimmer has proved conclusively (*Runenschrift*, p. 244) that the O. N. symbol for *Y* was, at an earlier period, applied to the final R (sometimes to the *æ* sound), and was then known as *elgR*. Later this O. N. runic letter displaced a *Y*-symbol, which had been formed by a modification of the *U*-rune, and then borrowed from the Old English alphabet the name of *Y* (or modified *U*), *Țr*. Professor Holthausen's argument, or rather assertion (*Anglia*, xxxv, 175-177) that O. E. *Țr* had the meaning "horn" seems to me quite unconvincing, and in any case has small bearing upon my discussion of the runic passages.

<sup>21</sup>See Wimmer, p. 236.

<sup>22</sup>See Stephens, i, 106 f.

<sup>23</sup>Wimmer, pp. 276, 282.

<sup>24</sup>C. F. Brown's statement (*Englische Studien*, 38, 208) that "Cook on the basis of Wimmer's researches, brings forward evidence to show that in older Anglo-Saxon the *Y*-rune did not represent *Țr* at all," rests upon a misunderstanding of Cook's imperfect summary (*Christ*, pp. 158-160) of Wimmer. Such third-hand dicta are always dangerous.

<sup>25</sup>Wimmer, pp. 287-288.

<sup>26</sup>The rune-name of *Y* is associated with *boga* (*bōgum*) in the word-play of *Riddle* 1.

<sup>27</sup>See my article, "The Philological Legend of Cynewulf," *P. M. L. A.*, xxvi (1911), 235-279.

<sup>28</sup>Cozijn, § 32, pp. 60-61.

<sup>29</sup>See Bülbring, §§ 186-187.

clusion that the inevitable Wessex interpretation of the *Y*-rune in our version was not that given to it by Cynewulf himself. Let us appreciate the exigencies of these acrostics. As the ordinary meaning of the established rune-name of the desired letter *Y*—*ȳr*, “bow”—would not serve, the poet was driven to seek some word sufficiently similar in sound to lie within the reach of readers trained to word-play. The form *i(e)rre* must have been perfectly familiar to him, whatever his dialect,<sup>30</sup> and even *iorre* would not have been disdained by an acrostic writer in sore straits. That neither *irre* nor *iorre* (granting that the later *yr(re)* was unknown to Cynewulf) began with *y* was of course an obstacle, but he was forced to overleap it. His choice was sadly restricted, for no other Old English word of similar sound furnished the necessary connotations.

The meanings of *yr(re)*—originally *i(o)rre*—accord exactly with the context in each of the three passages. *Christ*. 799–800, *pendan Yr(re) ond Nȳd ȳbast meahtan | frofre findan* may be rendered, “When Anger and Distress might most easily find solace.” This interpretation receives strong support from *Paris Psalter* 67<sup>1</sup>, *Hē* (God) *þā gehæftan hǣleð snōme | ond þā tō yrre bēoð ealle gecigde* (“eos qui in ira provocant”). *Elene* 1260, *Yr(re) gnornade*, “He, wandering in error (“confused” or “disturbed”),<sup>31</sup> grieved,” seems more in keeping with the intransitive function of *gnornode* and with the *nȳdgefēra* of the next line than the renderings of those commentators who accept the arbitrary *yfel*, “He

mourned his woe.” Finally we may translate *Fates*, 103–104, *þonne Cēn(e) ond Yr(re) cræftes nēosað | nihtes nearowe*,<sup>32</sup> “Then shall the bold man and the man of wrath seek for strength in the narrow night-watches.”

There can be no legitimate objections to the forms and meanings, *Nȳd*, “need,” “distress,” *Eoh*, “horse” and *Wynn*, “joy,” “winsomeness” for the three runes, *N*, *E* and *W*, inasmuch as the traditional name-words are employed and the meanings accord with the context.

The *U*-rune or *ȳr* certainly does not bear in the acrostics that meaning which is assigned to it in the *Runic Poem*, 4–6, but which occurs nowhere else in Old English,—“bull” or “bison.” The common connotation of *ȳr(e)* suggested by the context, “our,” “ours” is confirmed, as Gollancz long since pointed out,<sup>33</sup> by the alphabet in ms. Domitian A 9 (see Hempl’s reproduction) where *ȳr* is interpreted “noster.” To Trautmann’s fallacious objection that the runes can represent only substantives, the Domitian rendering is, as Krapp says,<sup>34</sup> quite sufficient answer.<sup>35</sup> In the objection of Brown<sup>36</sup> that this possessive use of the *U*-rune runs counter to the sense and grammatical construction of the several passages I can find no weight. Dr. Brown is quite unconsciously biassed by his desire to exclude from the acrostics all subjective significance. *ȳr(e) was gēara | geogoðhādes glām*, “Ours was of yore the gleam of youth,” says Cynewulf finely in the *Elene*, 1266–1267. If he departs from the normal order of words here or elsewhere, it is obviously because he is forced to do so by the hard conditions of his task of introducing runes into proper places in the scheme of his alliterative verse. Under such circumstances a large liberty is per-

<sup>30</sup> The form *irre* creeps at least once into the *Durham Ritual* (12, 18) among many instances of *iorre*; and the unbroken vowel persists in several Anglian words in this category, *firr*, *cirnel*, *hirtan* (Bülbring, *Englische Studien*, 27, 85). *Eorre* and *yrre* run a parallel course in West-Saxon (*Christ* 620, *þurh yrre hyge*; *Elene* 685, *þurh eorne hyge*), indeed late into Middle English (Bradley-Stratmann, s. v. *irre*).

<sup>31</sup> This translation of *Yrre* is sustained by *Psalter* 75<sup>4</sup> *ealle synt yrre, þā þe unwise heora heortan hige healdað mid dysige*, “turbati sunt insipientes.” It is possible that the spirited picture (in this *Elene* acrostic) of the sorrows of ‘the man who gains treasure and whose horse measures the mile-paths’ (long supposed to be Cynewulf himself) was suggested to the poet by the account (in this very Psalm) of the helplessness of ‘the seekers after wealth’ (*þā þe welan sōhton*) and of ‘those who once rode on horses’ (*þā þe on horsum hwilon wæron*).

<sup>32</sup> The half-line, *þonne cēn(e) ond yr(re)* is of the same metrical type as the immediately preceding, *efne swā lago tōglideð*. *Cēne ond yrre* recalls the stock phrase, *yrre ond rēðe* (*Ps.* 77<sup>10</sup>, *Jul.* 140).

<sup>33</sup> Cynewulf’s *Christ*, pp. 181–182.

<sup>34</sup> *Andreas*, p. 169.

<sup>35</sup> It is noteworthy that *inc* is substituted for the seemingly unintelligible *Ing* as a rune-name, in the Domitian alphabet, and that in ms. Galba A 2, where new and scholarly runes are in the making, we meet the Latin words, “hunc,” “ego,” “ecce” as runic-names or, at least, as rune-equivalents.

<sup>36</sup> *Englische Studien*, 38, 213–216.

mitted to a poet. Brown's further objection that the meaning, "our" does not harmonize with the construction in the *Fates* passage, 100-102, because *æfter tōhrēosan* should rightly follow its subject, rests upon a complete misunderstanding of the sense of these lines. They should be so pointed and read :—

Wynn sceal gedrēosan  
 after tōhrēosan,  
 Ūr(e) on ēðle,  
 læne lices frætewa.

"Our earthly joy shall fall and afterwards perish, the fleeting adornments of the body." This interpretation is supported by the double likeness to the *Christ* passage, 804-807. There as here *fræthwa* is in apposition with the runic subject *Wynn*; and there *Ūr(e)* modifies *lifwynna dæl* in just such wise as it qualifies here *Wynn on ēðle*. A similar association of the two verbs, *drēosað* and *hrēosað*, with one subject is found in *Dōmesdæg* 101. Now Trautmann and Brown ask us to believe that Cynewulf expected his readers to put aside all thought of the apposite word, *Ūr*, which in one meaning or another is always associated with the *U*-rune (even though in the immediately preceding runes, as Brown at least admits, he had suggested the usual rune-names, *Nȳd*, *Eoh*, *Wynn*) and to conjure up a word, which not only is never connected with the runic symbol, but which never appears anywhere in Old English poetry. The unhappy suggestion of these scholars is self-condemned, as soon as we pause and consider whether a prose word, *Unne*, in its most technical meaning of "legal grant" (Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.*, iv, 276, 31) could ever have presented itself to the Anglo-Saxon mind, deep in the contemplation of a poet's portrayal of our latter end. No, the runic game was fairly played.

The interpretation of the two runes, *L* and *F*, gives small occasion for discussion until we come to the *Juliana* passage. *Lagu* and *Feoh* are unquestionably the readings in the *Christ*, the *Elene* and the *Fates*. Trautmann's suggestion that we take *Juliana* 707, *LF* (which is followed by singular verbs) as *lic-fæt* is open to the double objection that *lic* and *fæt*, having never at any time been associated with the runes, would never present themselves to Anglo-Saxon thought, and that they are not in accord with the meanings of the symbols in the other rune-passages. Brown's

*lago-flōd*, though it has this much in its favor that it concedes the proper rune-name to *L*, and is in keeping with the *lago-flōdum* (*L-flōdum*) of *Christ* 805, is really quite as objectionable as Trautmann's impossible *lic-fæt*, inasmuch as it requires the reader to interpret one letter as a word, the other as an initial. Let me repeat that the Old English runes are used in but two ways: either as substitutes for their traditional name-words or as letter groups spelling words or parts of words (so in the *Juliana*, *CYN* and *EWU*, and indeed in our acrostics viewed as wholes). Now it is clear that *LF* unlike *CYN* and *EWU* can spell nothing. The only other alternative, since a compound is dictated to us by the context, is to interpret the two runes as *lago-feoh*. The compound does not occur elsewhere (it is obviously made to order by the poet), but it is immediately suggested to the reader by the runes, and finds support in the meaning of *feoh*, "property in land," "estate," "share of earth" in the runic passage of the *Elene* (*Feoh* . . . *landes frætwe*) and in the closing lines of the *Christ* acrostic :—

Ūre (*U*) wæs longe  
*Lagu* (*L*)—flōdum bilocen    lifwynna dæl,  
*Feoh* (*F*) on foldan.

In his use of *lagufeoh*, "watery estate (earth)" Cynewulf is doubtless recalling that biblical passage, which, as Cook thinks,<sup>87</sup> furnished the inspiration of the lines in the *Christ*, 2 Peter, iii, 5, "terra de aqua et per aquam consistens Dei verbo, per quae ille tunc mundus aqua inundatus perit." *Lagufeoh* and "terra de aqua et per aquam consistens" are certainly exact equivalents. It is, of course, quite possible that, in his picture of a "watery world" at the Judgment, our poet had in mind such a conception of Doomsday as that presented in other Anglo-Saxon poems :—*Christ* 1143-6, *ond sēo eorðe ēac . . . beofode on bearhtme; ond se brāda sē . . . of clomme bræc | ūp yrringa on eorþan fæðm; Salomon and Saturn*, 320-321, *Sōna bið gesiēne, siððan flōwan mōt | ȳð ofer eall lond*, or in the *Exeter Book* version of

<sup>87</sup> *Christ*, p. 165.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *Psalms* xxiv, 2, "Ipse super maria fundavit eam (terram)"; cxxxvi, 6, "Qui fundavit terram super aquam."

"The Last Judgment," *Dæt gelimpan sceal, þætte lagu flōweð, / flōd ofer foldan*. Moreover, Cynewulf's use of *beofað* with *lagufeoð* ("the watery earth trembles") is entirely in keeping with the associations of the verb in other Old English sketches of the Judgment;<sup>39</sup> and the relation of *lagufeoð* to *seomað sorgcearig* is paralleled by the phrase of *Phoenix* 19-20, *se wong seomað eadig ond onsund*. We may now be sure that Cynewulf and his contemporary readers gave to the *LF* runes of the *Juliana* the same word-names as to the corresponding symbols of the *Christ*, *Elene* and *Fates*.

Now let us draw together the threads of our skein. I have made no attempt to deal with the inner significance of the runic passages of Cynewulf's poetry, nor to grapple with minor and perhaps insoluble questions of textual criticism, but I have tried to show very briefly that, in the poet's use of runes in his acrostics, he was following perfectly understood conventional principles that compelled the association of the symbols with certain traditional naming words and peremptorily forbade arbitrary and misleading substitutions.

FREDERICK TUPPER, JR.

University of Vermont.

## NOTES ON ORSINA

No character of Lessing is worked out with more care and presented with greater passion than is Orsina. Conti, the Prince and Marinelli all prepare the reader for her entrance; when she finally appears, she so over-shadows them and they have so misinterpreted her in their narrow way, that the reader is startled anew and marvels at the power of Lessing to prepare and yet surprise, to motivate carefully and yet constantly develop, to suggest by a word or phrase

the line of action and that that the characters have gone through in their off-stage intervals.

Under the surface, both the Prince and Marinelli are brutal and coarse and are sensually inclined, with a low attitude toward women. The Prince makes frequent attempts to maintain the standards of a gentleman but his newly awakened disgust for Orsina, after the affair is over, makes it difficult for him to observe the decencies of polite intercourse in speaking with her, while in speaking of her both he and Marinelli betray their fundamental misinterpretation of her character.

Orsina is for them the bookish woman, given over to a certain intellectual attitude of mind toward life which they, as essentially unintellectual men, do not understand and hence fear. That they are unintellectual is evident: the Prince has no real mind for the business of government or intrigue and Marinelli, for all his plotting, is an extempore villain, not of dash and courage, but rather of treachery, cowardice and opportunism, who rises and falls by a series of petty lies manufactured for the moment and current only in the face of a weakling like Hettore. Neither Orsina nor Appiani is deceived by them. In these scenes, especially in the scenes with Orsina, it is difficult to see in Marinelli any survival of the Mefisto of some lost Faust; even the Mefistofeleian comment of ironical semi-attention ("Lauter Bewunderung," Act IV., sc. 3) on the extravagant play of wit, fancy and despair in Orsina, is the remark of a limited courtier-nature.

For the Prince, there is more suspicion, more of a lurking feeling of discomfort, and this discomfort has always been present in the liaison with Orsina. It is not merely the result of the fostering of the affair by a court clique. The joy and freedom of the physical appeal are balanced by a certain contempt for Orsina's intellect. She knows how he feels. She knows that she is the woman who *will* think in spite of the men who would make a toy of her. As her main-spring of character is still her love for the Prince, she can feel that "that way madness lies." His interpretation of her, that her bookishness which had repulsed him

<sup>39</sup> In *Christ* 826-7, 881, 1143-4, *Dōmesdæg* 112 (cf. *Guthlac* 1299, *Har. Hell* 20, *Dream of Rood* 36, *Psalter* 81) *beofian* is used of a "trembling earth" (never of "trembling waters," as the reading *laguflōd* in our passage would demand).